



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

legibility, beauty, economy of effort, and economy of space. In the course of twenty-five pages these principles are applied to the actually attested forms of the letters in question in such a way as to show clearly the historical development of form from the original capital to the modern printed or cursive form.

A useful index concludes this interesting and suggestive volume of essays which will stand as a mute protest against the too prevalent notion that a successful appeal to the larger audience must necessarily be unscholarly and that good scholarship means boredom.

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

TOLMAN, HERBERT CUSHING: *Ancient Persian Lexicon and the Texts of the Achaemenidan Inscriptions transliterated and translated with special Reference to their recent Re-examination.* XII + 134 pp. New York, 1908. \$1.25.

The book under consideration presents, in compact form, a most valuable summary of nearly all accessible data on the Old Persian inscriptions, a theme to which Prof. Tolman has devoted himself for many years, and in which he must be regarded as the leading American authority. The new collation of the text of the Behistūn inscriptions *in situ* by King and Thompson and a similar, though more partial, examination by Jackson have placed Old Persian studies on a far firmer footing than ever before, though a like collation of the remaining texts still remains an urgent necessity, and problems are yet found in unwelcome abundance. Tolman's book appears at a happy moment, for the edition of King and Thompson, like the final installment of Weissbach and Bang's *Altpersische Keilinschriften*, is in many respects disappointing to the Old Persian scholar. The work naturally falls into two divisions: text and translation, and lexicon, an order which the title unfortunately reverses. The texts are admirably transliterated, the only errors noted being *tyⁿa* for *tyⁿā* (Bh. i, 23), and *adamšām* for *adamšā[m]* (Dar. NRa, 18). The translation is equally careful, though the reviewer cannot assent to the following details: *ā[mātā]* (Bh. i, 7, Bh. a, 11) means "valiant" rather than "of ancient lineage" (cf. Bartholomae, *Altiran. Wb.*, 1165 f.); *hauv adakaīy naiy* [*a*] *vadā* [*āha*] (Bh. ii, 24) (for the supplement cf. Tolman, p. 69) means "he then [was] not there" rather than "did not there [withstand]"; *avabāšām hamaranam kartam* (Bh. ii, 36 f. and often) would more literally be translated "then their battle [was] made" than "then the battle [was] fought by them"; *frāha* *jam* (Bh. ii, 78) is "hanged", not "haled" (cf. Bartholomae, 1743); *viḍāpatiy* (Bh. iii, 26) is rather "at home" (cf. Tolman, p. 125) than "in the palace"; *pasā* (Bh. iii, 32) is "behind", not "with"; *hamahyāyā* *ḥarda* (Bh. iv, 4 f. and often) is "in like fashion", not "in the

same year", despite the arguments on p. 96 (cf. Turfān תורפאן, "similar", Bartholomae, *Zum Altiran. Wb.*, 233, Salemann, *Manichäische Studien*, i, 81); *Asagartiya* (Bh. iv, 20 f.) is "Sagartian", not "in Sagartia" (cf. Tolman, p. 71); *avaθā dī[š akunavam]* (Bh. iv, 36, v, 17, 33) means "so I made them" rather than "so I did unto them"; *tya manā kartam varnavatām θuvām* (Bh. iv, 42 f., cf. 53 f.) should be rendered "let what was done by me convince thee" rather than "let it convince thee [as to] what [was] done by me"; [*pasāva ya*]θā (Bh. v. 3) is "alter that", not "when"; *aniyam* (Bh. v, 26; so also i, 86 f.) seems to mean "one man . . . another man" rather than "one part." The reviewer is also unable to accept the reading *ušašma* (Bh. i, 75, 89), which is certainly, as Jackson holds (see Tolman, pp. 14, 16, 75), the word-divider *plus šašma*; and in Bh. iv, 46 *ap[ima]iy* is to be read, with Bartholomae, *Altiran. Wb.*, 83, *utāmaiy*, "by the grace of Ahura Mazda and myself" (cf. *vašnā Auramazdāhā manatā*, "by the grace of Ahura Mazda and me", in *Dar. Pers.* e, 9 f.).

In his preface Prof. Tolman fails to make clear that the Koldey fragment (ed. Weissbach, *Babylonische Miscellen*, pl. ix, pp. 24 ff.) parallels the Babylonian rather than the Old Persian or New Susian text, and in his notes the giving of the meanings of the Turfān words would have aided the beginner, e. g., "awakens" for *vīgarānēd* (p. 5, note 3), "deceit" for *drōzanīy* (p. 25, note 1), "of gods the most godly" for *bagān bagīystōm* (p. 37, note 1) and "contentment" for *hūnisandēft* (p. 95). In p. 3, note 2, an allusion might have been made to the Persian *rā* as an accusative sign and to the Slavic *radi*, as in Old Church Slav *togo radi*, "therefore" (cf. Vondrák, *Vergl. slav. Gramm.*, ii, 387). In p. 9, note 1, the Avesta series (e. g., *Yasht* x, 18) *nmānōpaiti, vīspaiti, zantupaiti, danhupaiti* is more important than their later Turfān equivalents; and the same remark applies to the Avesta *ava-harəz*, "renounce", (Skr. *ava-sarj*) as compared with the Turfān *hērz* (p. 70), while the Pāli and Prakṛt *idha*, "here", should have been mentioned along with Avesta *īda*, Skt. *iha* under Old Persian *idā* (p. 73). The Skt. *pathi* is a closer analogue to the Old Persian *paθi*, "way, path", than is *panthan* (p. 108); but the Middle Persian (Turfān) *ن* cannot be derived from *tya* (p. 94; cf. Caland, *Zur Syntax der Pronomina im Avesta*, p. 24), nor can the New Persian *nun* (p. 107) be directly compared with the Old Persian *nūram*, "now."

A number of details might be added from the Turfān manuscripts, which Tolman gives the great weight which they deserve. Citation may accordingly be made of the following points, the references being to Salemann's *Manichäische Studien*, i: *אורמזד* (Salemann, p. 49) for *Auramazdāh* (p. 60); with the reading *up[ā]yam* (Bh. i, 91 f.) compare *אובאיניר*, which seems to be a causative of *upa-i* (Salemann, p. 47); with *ubarta*, "well esteemed", contrast the Turfān antonym *רזון*, "mistreated, unfortunate" (Salemann, p. 66); to the New Persian *kār-zār*, "battle-

field" (p. 82), add the Turfān כַּאֲרִי צֶאֱר (Salemann, p. 88); with the reading *ha^mgmātā* (p. 87) compare Turfān *hanzāmāy*, "con-cites" (Bartholomae, *Zum Altiran. Wh.*, p. 161 f.); וִיט "village", is a closer parallel to the Old Persian *viθ* (p. 124) than *vīsbed* (Salemann, p. 75); וִיטָף וִיטָנ may be the Turfān equivalent of the Old Persian *vispazana*, "possessing all kinds of people" (Salemann, p. 75); and the Old Persian *hamiθriya*, "rebellious", is represented in the Turfān fragments by חִמִּים (Salemann, p. 84).

A few misprints call for notice: *va]rtiyaīy* instead of *va]rtiyaīy* (pp. 26, 122; cf. WZKM. xxii, 69); *mama* instead of *mana* (p. 62, line 31); 623 instead of 613 (p. 91, line 15); and "afterwards", representing a deleted *pasāva* (Bh. ii, 49), has inadvertently been overlooked (p. 13, line 30). It is unfortunate that the inscription Xerx. Sus. (p. 1) was not repeated in its proper place on p. 47 f., and it is still more unfortunate that the texts and translations fail to face each other almost throughout the book.

The addenda et corrigenda recorded in the preceding lines must in no wise be construed as condemnatory, and the reviewer may perhaps be permitted to repeat from his briefer notice of this volume in the *Nation* (July 16, 1909) his general impression that the work under consideration "must be regarded for many years to come as the best edition thus far made, not only of the Behistūn texts, but of the entire body of Old Persian inscriptions. . . . The *crucēs* in the text are treated with the utmost care, and the few *lacunae* which can reasonably be supplied are filled with plausible conjectures."

LOUIS H. GRAY.